REMARKS

In the Office action, the specification was objected to for self-editing; claim 56 was objected to as being incomplete; claims 8 and 28-47 were rejected as being anticipated by Roehl; claims 8, 28-38 and 57-59 were rejected as anticipated by Dietrich '610; and claims 48-55 were allowed.

As to the specification, the Office action correctly notes that the specification included edits from the translator of the German document. These translator comments have been deleted. The objection as to page 1 of the specification has also been corrected. Moreover, incomplete claim 56 has been canceled.

As to the rejections on the merits, claim 8 is amended to clarify that the rigid hollow cylinder comprises gas permeable material. Roehl does not show any such structure. Roehl shows hoses 16, 22 which would be impermeable to gas, and an element 20 which is not made of gas permeable material. Although Dietrich shows a gas permeable filter, such filter clearly cannot be and is not a rigid hollow cylinder. Claim 39 is amended to recite that the rigid hollow element is comprised of a gas permeable material. Again, Roehl shows no such structure and Dietrich does not show a hollow rigid element that comprises a gas permeable material.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claim 57-59 in view of Dietrich is respectfully requested. Claim 57 recites the step of purging the metering volume by applying purge gas into the metering volume other than by filtering through the gas permeable material. It is believed that Dietrich has no teaching about purging, and in any event positive pressure gas can only enter the metering chambers 14 through the filter 16. Dietrich does not teach, show or suggest any other or additional way to pressurize the metering chamber.

New claims 60-64 are directed to additional features of the invention. Claim 60 recites a chamber at least partially defined by a gas permeable material so that negative pressure conveys powder into the chamber and positive pressure is applied to the chamber interior other than by filtering through the gas permeable material. Neither Roehl nor Dietrich suggest a chamber defined by a gas permeable material and in which positive pressure is applied to the chamber interior other than by filtering through the gas permeable material. New claims 65-67 are directed to the use of a source of pressurized gas to provide positive and negative pressure to a chamber for conveying powder.

It is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 17, 2005

By: _____
Leonard L. Lewis, Reg. No. 31,176
(216) 622-8683